



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,387	09/23/2003	Zheng Tan	IP-024170	2460
1726	7590	12/06/2006	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY 6285 TRI-RIDGE BOULEVARD LOVELAND, OH 45140			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1731	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/668,387

Applicant(s)

TAN ET AL.

Examiner

José A. Fortuna

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I in the reply filed on September 26, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a). This rejection is set forth in the prior Office action mailed on December 14, 2004.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on June 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the primary reference, Lindahl, teaches removing metal from chips prior to subsequent treatments such as digestion, etc., and that the treatment taught by Lindahl is done to the chips not to the fibers, which is diametrical opposed to the treatment of already defibered chips, i.e., fiber pulp. The arguments are unconvincing for the following reasons:

- The independent claims teach an ion-activated peroxide treatment, which is interpreted as a peroxide treatment done to the pulp, such pulp having ions that activate the peroxide. That is, the peroxide treatment is done to the pulp. The claims do not recite that the ions are added to the pulp in conjunction with the peroxide. Therefore, the primary reference by itself teaches the limitations of the claims, since it teaches the reduction of ions on the chips, to levels within the claimed range, see Tables I and II, and then the chips are digested; treated with peroxide as a pulp, see column 4, lines 22-56 and figure 1, and then refined, see figure 1, second refining step. The secondary reference was used to further evidence the benefits of adding metal ions into a peroxide bleaching.
- Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicants argue that the secondary reference only teaches the addition of metal and metal derivatives to pulps to be used in the viscose production. This is unconvincing, because the secondary reference, Kempf, teaches that the peroxide treated pulp is to be use in papermaking, column 3, lines 45-61 and teaches that the addition of the metals activates the selectivity to the oxidative attack, referring to the pulp which is used for papermaking, column 4, line 38 through column 5, line 34, see also the examples. Applicants also argue that the combination of the references, Lindahl and Kempf, is improper, because the primary reference teaches away the addition of metals in the process. This is not convincing, because what Lindahl, the primary reference, teaches is

Art Unit: 1731

the reduction of heavy metals in the process to a degree in which the effectiveness of the peroxide is degraded or reduced. Lindahl shows in the tables, e.g. table II, that the heavy metal, Iron for this particular instance, was reduced to 37 ppm. Kempf teaches that adding certain metals, non-heavy metals, help the peroxide treatment. Therefore, the teachings are not incompatible. Note also that Lindahl teaches that the pulp/chips contain(s) traces of Iron, in the same range as claimed and disclosed, and therefore, the primary reference reads on the claims as claimed, specially for claims 10-19 that do not require the addition of any component.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1731

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


José A. Fortuna
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1731

JAF